	Case 3:07-cv-03254-SI Document 6	Filed 06/21/2007 Page 1 of 3				
1						
2	LINGEL H. WINTERS, ESQ. (SBN 37759) LAW OFFICES OF LINGEL H. WINTERS					
3	A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION					
	One Maritime Plaza, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94111					
4	Telephone: (415) 398-2941 Facsimile: (415) 393-9887					
5						
6	GIRARDI & KEESE   THOMAS V. GIRARDI (SBN 36603)					
7	1126 Wilshire Blvd. Los Angeles, CA 90017-1904					
8	Telephone (213) 977-0211					
ŀ	Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Putative Class					
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
11	NORTHER DISTRICT OF CHER OR WIT					
12						
13		MDL No. M:07-cv-01827 SI				
14	IN RE TFT-LCD (FLAT PANEL)ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Case No. C-07-cv-2796 SI				
15		CLASS ACTION				
16 17	EMW, Inc. v. LG Philips LCD CO., LTD et al. Case No. C-07-2796 SI	MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME				
	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO	Date: July 10, 2007				
18	ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS	Time: 10:00 a.m.				
19		Hon. Susan Illston Courtroom: 10				
20						
21						
22						
23	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-3, plaintiff and moving party EMW, Inc. moves the Court for an					
24	order shortening time to hear plaintiff's Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the					
25	California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.					
26	On June 4, 2007, plaintiff EMW, Inc. filed its Reply Memorandum Indirect Purchaser					
27	Leadership Proposal of Lingel H. Winters P.C. in the belief that the hearing on various class					
28						
.		1				

MOTION FOR ORDER SHORTING TIME

motions was firmly set for June 8, 2007 and that there was no further time in which to take action. On June 5, 2007, the Court continued the motions to July 10, 2007. With this continuance in hand, plaintiff undertook to engage co-counsel to join in filing its Motion To Appoint Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup. On June 18, Thomas V. Girardi of Girardi & Keese agreed to join as co-counsel and plaintiff set about finalizing said Motion. It is believed that said Motion will simplify the case and increase the manageability and judicial economy for the case, and that therefore, it is in the interest of all parties and the Court for said Motion to be heard on July 10, 2007.

Substantial harm or prejudice will occur if the time for hearing the motion is not shortened in several regards:

- 1) The Court and putative classes will be deprived of the appropriate competition among law firms for service to them.
- 2) The manageability of the indirect purchasers action may be adversely affected by consolidated representation of claimants claiming under the laws of 20-30 different states. The Motion contends that manageability and commonality can only be achieved by subgrouping the various claims.

Some counsel claim that claimants claiming under the differing laws of 20-30 states may be represented by one consolidated group of attorneys. Plaintiff contends that such representation could undermine commonality and predominance and lead to conflicts. Plaintiff contends that there is a natural subgrouping that arises from the complaint in *Eliasoph v. LG Philips Co, Ltd. et al.*, breaks the claimants down into three natural groups:

- 1) Subgroup One: California Claims (Eliasoph Second, Third Claims)
  - SubGroup Two: Claims under Other Repealer States with laws involving "Violations of State Antitrust and Unfair Competition

	Case 3:07-cv-03254-SI	Document 6	Filed 06/21/2007	Page 3 of 3
1	Laws" – Eliasoph Fourth Claim)			
2	3) Subgroup Three: Claims under State laws claimed as "Violations of			
3	State Consumer Protection and Unfair Competition Laws – <i>Eliasoph</i>			
4	Fifth Claim.			
5	In such cases as <i>Walsh v. Ford Motor Co.</i> (D.C. Cir. 1986) 807 F.2d 1000, 1017 and <i>In Re</i>			
6	School Asbestos Litigation 789 F.2d 996 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1986), the Courts concluded various and			
7 8	differing state claims may satisfy the predominance and commonality requirement where			
9	subgrouping of such State claims in employed.			
10				
11	The Motion also contends that such subgrouping minimizes conflicts.			
12	Since multiple parties are involved in this complex action, the best notice is by ECF and it			
13	would be impractical to seek stipulation.			
14	WHEFORE plaintiff prays for an Order Shortening Time for plaintiff's Motion to Appoint			
15	Interim Class Counsel For the California Indirect Purchasers Subgroup.			
16				
17	Dated: June <u>21</u> , 2007	L	AW OFFICES OF LI	NGEL H. WINTERS
18		A	PROFESSIONAL CO	ORPORATION
19			1110	IX Winters
20   21		В	Lingel H. Winter	
22			ŭ	
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				